



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trad mark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/255,222 02/22/99 WILLIAMS M P2160/170178

IM22/1230

EXAMINER

JOHN S PRATT
KILPATRICK STOCKTON
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2800
ATLANTA GA 30309-4530

HRUSKOCI, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1724

6

DATE MAILED:

12/30/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/255,222	Williams et al.
Examiner	Group Art Unit
Hruskoci	1724

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4-26 & 9-14-99.
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5 Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 6 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1724

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sargent et al. 5,234,466. It is submitted that Sargent et al. disclose (see col. 1 lines 54-61 and col. 3 lines 4-13) a method for decreasing the amount of sulfuric acid required by a papermaking process, and adjusting the pH of a process stream or solution of a papermaking process as recited in the instant claims, respectively.

3. Claims 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sargent et al. 5,672,279. It is submitted that Sargent et al. disclose (see col. 1 lines 15 through col. 2 line 20 and col. 3 lines 10 through col. 4 line 10) a method for decreasing the amount of hydrochloric acid required by a papermaking process, and adjusting the pH of a process stream or solution of a papermaking process as recited in the instant claims, respectively.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior

Art Unit: 1724

art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ackel or Nakajima et al. in view of Sargent et al. 5,234,466.. Ackel (see col. 2 lines 16 through 63) and Nakajima et al. (see col. 1 line 55 through col. 2 line 60) disclose a method for flocculating or precipitating a material in a process stream or solution of a pulping or papermaking process substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Ackel and Nakijima et al. by reciting the addition of urea sulfate. Sargent et al. disclose (see col. 1 lines 54-61 and col. 3 lines 4-13) that it is known in the art to decrease the amount of sulfuric acid required by a papermaking process, or adjust the pH of a process stream or solution of a papermaking process stream by the addition of urea sulfate. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the process of Ackel or Nakajima et al. by addition of urea sulfate in view of the teachings of Sargent et al., to aid in adjusting the pH of the stream or solution.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (703) 308-

Art Unit: 1724

3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. David Simmons, can be reached on (703) 308-1972. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.



Peter A. Hruskoci
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

P. Hruskoci
December 18, 1999